DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 087 834 UD 014 072

TITLE	Lincoln Center Student Program. State Urban Education Program.
INSTITUTION	New York Univ., N.Y. Center for Field Research and School Services.
SPONS AGENCY	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Aug 72
NOTE	54p.; Function Number 17-05465
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Communication Skills; Curriculum Development; *Economically Disadvantaged; *English Programs; *Fine Arts; High School Curriculum; *High School Students; Inner City; Language Development; Literature Appreciation; Mass Media; Program Evaluation; Theater Arts
IDENTIFIERS	*New York City

ABSTRACT

The Lincoln Center Student Program for 1971-72 was planned as a comprehensive program in the performing arts for senior high schools selected by the New York City Board of Education and located in federally designated poverty areas of New York City. The program was intended to provide a concentrated instructional program within the English curriculum of each school which would relate the performing arts to literature, media, language growth, and general learning improvement. It was also to cause a general improvement of awareness, understanding, knowledge and appreciation of the performing arts by involving students and teachers in a performing arts curriculum. Several program objectives were enunciated, including: (1) providing an intensive instructional program in visual and aural literacy; (2) increasing verbal and non-verbal communication skills; (3) sharpening perceptions so "listening and looking become active hearing and seeing"; (4) increasing the store of information and facts about the performing arts; (5) developing a performing arts vocabulary to enable students to speak and write critically about these arts; (6) increasing opportunities for productive communication between artists and young people; (7) increasing responsiveness to the arts by providing opportunities to originate, participate in and observe performances; (8) assisting teachers in classroom instruction through seminars, planning sessions and workshops; and, (9) evaluating student responses and work as evidence of increased interest and knowledge. (Author/JM)

ED 087834

LINCOLN CENTER STUDENT PROGRAM

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

STATE URBAN EDUCATION PROGRAM

An evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded by the New York State Urban Education Program enacted at the 1970 Legislative Session of the New York State Legislature for the purpose of "meeting special educational needs associated with poverty." (Education Law 3602, subdivision 11 as amended.) Performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1971-1972 school year.

Evaluation Co-Directors
Professor Roger C. Boardman
Professor Jerrold Ross

Staff Associate
Associate Professor Marion V. James

CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND FIELD SERVICES
School of Education
New York University

UD 014072

August, 1972

New York University

School of Education
Center for Educational Research and Field Services
Office of Off-Campus Courses

51 Press Building
Washington Square
New York, N.Y. 10003
Telephone: (212) 598-2898, 3425

September 30, 1972

Dr. David Abramson
Acting Director
Bureau of Educational Research
BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Dear Dr. Abramson:

In fulfillment of the agreement dated June 14, 1972 between the New York City Public Schools and the Center for Educational Research and Field Services, I am pleased to submit three hundred copies of the final report, Lincoln Center Student Program.

The Bureau of Educational Research and the professional staff of the New York City Public Schools were most cooperative in providing data and facilitating the study in general. Although the objective of the team was to evaluate a project funded under State Urban Education, this report goes beyond this goal. Explicit in this report are recommendations for modifications and improvement of the program. Consequently, this report will serve its purpose best if it is studied and discussed by all who are concerned with education in New York City -- the Board of Education, professional staff, students, parents, lay leaders, and other citizens. To this end, the study team is prepared to assist with the presentation and interpretation of its report. In addition, the study team looks forward to our continued affiliation with the New York City Public Schools.

You may be sure that New York University and its School of Education will maintain a continuing interest in the schools of New York City.

Respectfully submitted,

ARNOLD SPINNER
Director

AS:jh

CONTENTS

Introduction 1

General Description of the Program 2

Implementation of the Evaluation
- Selection of the Schools 4
- Development and Administration of the Instruments for Evaluation 5
- Observations and Interviews 6

Findings of the Evaluation 6
- Selection of Performance Chairmen 8
- Selection of Resource Professionals 8
- Involvement of Arts Departments 9
- Involvement of Classroom Teaching Personnel 9
- Relationship to Overall School Curriculum 9
- Preparation for Performances 10
- Scheduling 11

The Instruments
- Performing Artists 11
- Perception and Understanding of the Performing Arts 14
- The Performing Arts Program 18
- The Lincoln Center Student Program 20

Observations and Interviews 25

Evaluation of "Process" 26

Summary
- Student Attitudes 29
- Student Achievement 29
- Teacher Training 30
- Perceptions of School Administrators 30
- The Public Investment in Lincoln Center 32

Recommendations 32

Appendices A-J

Introduction

For the second consecutive year a team drawn from the Division of Music Education at New York University was responsible for the evaluation of part of the Lincoln Center Student Program, carried out by that institution in the high schools of New York City. The New York University evaluation team wishes to thank the Lincoln Center staff for the cooperation it afforded in both studies. In 1971 one of the major instruments for evaluation was jointly developed by Lincoln Center officials and the evaluation team from N.Y.U. In 1972 the concluding instrument was similarly constructed.

Special acknowledgment is due Marion Verse James, Associate Professor at Jersey City State College, currently a candidate for the doctorate at New York University, who assisted the project directors so capably in the execution of this evaluation, and to Mr. Andrew McKinley, Director of the Usdan Center for the Creative and Performing Arts, for his valuable editorial comments and suggestions.

General Description of the Program

The Lincoln Center Student Program for 1971-72 was planned as a comprehensive program in the performing arts for senior high schools selected by the New York City Board of Education and located in federally designated poverty areas of New York City.

The program was intended to provide a concentrated instructional program within the English curriculum of each school which would relate the performing arts to literature, media, language growth, and general learning improvement. It was also to cause a general improvement of awareness, understanding, knowledge and appreciation of the performing arts by involving students and teachers in a performing arts curriculum.

Several program objectives were enunciated, including:

1. providing an intensive instructional program in visual and aural literacy

2. increasing verbal and non-verbal communication skills

3. sharpening perceptions so "listening and looking become active hearing and seeing"

4. increasing the store of information and facts about the performing arts

5. developing a performing arts vocabulary to enable students to speak and write critically about these arts

6. increasing opportunities for productive communication between artists and young people

7. increasing responsiveness to the arts by providing opportunities to originate, participate in and observe performances

8. assisting teachers in classroom instruction through seminars, planning sessions and workshops

9. evaluating student responses and work as evidence of increased interest and knowledge

This year's operational plan involved an "artist-in-residence" approach. Three professional artists were assigned to classrooms for instructional purposes in each school. Each was a professional creative artist in his own field. The three areas represented were drama, dance and music. In each school one of these artists (designated by Lincoln Center as "resource professionals") acted as director of the program. In addition, a series of in-school performances were provided by Lincoln Center and were selected from the performing arts areas of drama, dance, music, film and opera to supplement and complement the work of the resource professionals.

In each school a group of students was selected to participate in the program. From this total group a "core" group was established who were to meet with the resource professionals for two periods each week over a thirty week span. The remainder of the group was divided into several smaller "target" groups who were to meet with resource professionals for one period per week for the same thirty week span.

(In the two schools studied for purposes of this evaluation there were extensive deviations from this original plan. They are discussed elsewhere in this report.)

Members of the New York City schools also cooperated with Lincoln Center in the administration of the program. In each school a performance chairman acted as liaison with the resource professional

director and coordinated the scheduling of classes and performances. Classroom teachers in the English department were also to assist in the implementation of the program.

Implementation of the Evaluation

a. Selection of the Schools

A sampling of the secondary schools involved in the program was made. It was decided to examine twenty percent, or two of the ten schools orignially designated for the program. Two specific schools were chosen based on the decision of the evaluation team to have an intensive evaluation and to look closely at a small sample of the population as opposed to a superficial review of all ten schools. In meeting the plan to provide an intensive evaluation for two schools, several observations were made (See Appendix E).

b. Development and Administration of the Instruments for Evaluation

Each of the program objectives of the original proposal were analyzed by the members of the evaluation team. As a result, questionnaires were developed and served as part of the basis of the evaluation. These questionnaires included:

(1) Performings Artists (See Appendix A)

(2) The Perception and Understanding of the Performing Arts (See Appendix B)

(3) The Performing Arts Program (See Appendix C)

(4) The Lincoln Center Student Program (This last inventory was jointly devised by Lincoln Center and the evaluation team) (See Appendix D)

The first three questionnaires were administered in both schools in March. It was necessary to begin this late in the school year because of a major population change in one school made in February. It was originally intended that a core group would have the benefit of the program throughout the school year. Yet, over the protests of the Lincoln Center project directors, the core group established in School A in October was disbanded by the school administration in January. In February a new core group of 18 students was substituted and they continued through May, meeting for two periods each week. A second administration of the first two tests, plus a first administration of the Lincoln Center Student Program was made late in May in both schools. These tests were administered to two core groups, two "four week" groups, and three "one-period-per-week" groups.

The instruments of the evaluation were designed to measure students' reactions to various aspects of the program as contained in the objectives set forth by Lincoln Center. Written, rather than oral, statements were the basis for the measurement in the expectation that not only would students react more objectively toward this type of questioning, but that the results of the written papers would demonstrate a grasp of a basic vocabulary of the arts. It was one of the prime objectives of the Lincoln Center program to create such a vocabulary and the investigators felt these terms should be sufficiently a part of the expression of students at the culmination of the program so that they would be able to communicate them on paper. The evaluation team, although in agreement with officials of Lincoln Center that

certain artistic perceptions continue to defy measurement, nevertheless felt strongly that positive attitudes and a fund of information such as were called for by the questionnaires administered are necessary -- indeed, vital -- if it was to be proved, or even assumed that any of the anticipated Lincoln Center program objectives took place.

c. Observations and Interviews

Other, more subjective evaluative mechanisms, such as observation by the team and oral interviews were utilized to effect as balanced a point of view as could be achieved. Oral interviews were conducted with resource professional directors and performance chairmen. Members of the evaluation team also visited two performances and three classroom sessions in School A, two performances, three classroom sessions in School B, as well as a final performance (an original production) put together by one of the four-week groups. It was noted that this was the only final performance given by the four-week groups in School B, and that the core groups in both schools never completed a final performance (See Appendix E).

Findings of the Evaluation

It is important for an understanding of the findings to give a brief description of how the performing arts programs were scheduled in the two high schools selected. It has already been noted that the population in School A changed in February, necessitating a beginning of testing early in March. The new core group thus created (18 students) continued through May, meeting for two periods each week.

In addition, another 54 students were divided into three groups, each

of which met for one period per week.

At School B there was a core group of 16 students which met from October through May for two periods each week. Finally, a group of approximately 14 students received concentrated training of two periods twice weekly from resource professionals for a period of four weeks only, at which time another new group began and continued for four weeks. Beginning with October, six "four-week" groups were trained.

As the evaluation progressed it became apparent that other "administrative" difficulties plagued the program. In an arts program total involvement of teachers and administrators is crucial. The best intentions can be, and often are, subverted by prevailing attitudes in the schools. The evaluation team discovered that neither the school officials nor the Lincoln Center staff had paid sufficient attention to this educational axiom, one that has long been known to arts educators but which, over the past two years of study of the Lincoln Center program by N.Y.U., while having been an objective put forth by Lincoln Center, was, unfortunately, not carried out by either the central Board of Education or the individual schools involved.

That delicate balance which must ensue between regular school staff and outside personnel (in this case the Lincoln Center resource professionals), between administrators of the various aspects of the program, and between a traditional curriculum and any "innovative" influences was not effected in the two schools studied.

Two diametrically opposing groups of personnel competed for time and influence, thereby assuring the failure of certain aspects

of the program and severely hampering others. The major difficulties fell into the following categories:

1. Selection of Performance Chairmen. In the two schools studied the performance chairmen were not fully involved with the program. In one instance, the individual was far too busy to devote the attention to so novel an idea as was required; in the second instance the performance chairman was almost completely uninvolved ("I go into a class only when I am invited.") In one school the performance chairman was committed to the concept of the program; in the other school it appeared as if the chairman was not. The Lincoln Center project director commented unfavorably on the selection of performance chairmen whom, it was felt, were chosen for that specific task on the basis of their availability rather than their commitment. The project director proposed that performance chairmen be selected, instead, using the criteria of power, responsibility, interest, and time. The evaluation team strongly concurs in this belief.

2. Selection of Resource Professionals. The continuity of a program such as this is vital to its anticipated success. Such continuity was not achieved. In each of the schools, one of the key persons was absent for a period of several weeks, fulfilling certain professional commitments (the evaluation team was told). One of the students remarked in one class observed, "What happened to the drama teacher?" The absence was obviously felt. This has, of course, the effect of minimizing the importance of such a program in the eyes of students who are enormously aware of teacher presence.

3. Involvement of arts departments. At neither school studied were the major arts departments involved. The Lincoln Center program was based in the English department of each school and, as this was to be in some way connected to literary studies and language development, it was a logical step. But to ignore the existence of supportive faculty and not to capitalize on their expertise was a major waste of valuable school resources.

4. Involvement of classroom teaching personnel. In most classes the assigned classroom teacher was completely uninvolved. One performance chairman did not think teachers should be involved. ("That's why the resource professionals are here.") As has been noted above, neither Lincoln Center nor the schools had made any provision for the preparation of classroom teachers. Lincoln Center's contact with performance chairmen was also minimal, most often taking the form of administrative meetings.

5. Relationship to the overall school curriculum. The Lincoln Center program for 1971-72 was originally designed to relate to the English curricula of the schools. "An intensive instructional program within the English curriculum relating the performing arts to literature, media, language growth and general learning improvement..." opened the Summary Form presented to the State Urban Education Program. Not only do the results of the student questionnaires demonstrate that this was not the case, but the observations by the evaluation team also bear it out. The absence of a study guide which certainly should have been developed if an arts program is to intervene in an established literature curriculum

was further testimony to this fact. Moreover, this absence and/or seeming lack of coordination between the English area and that of the arts instruction evidenced itself in the attitudes of teachers who absented themselves from such classes (noted above). One of the performance chairmen commented repeatedly on this lack. Apparently, the resource professionals in that school had been requested to become more involved with the regular curriculum, but the request was ignored. The fault with such an approach, however, is not entirely that of the resource professionals; the connection with academic personnel had not been established for them, either by the schools or by the Lincoln Center administrators.

6. Preparation for performances. Neither was the instructional program geared to performances which were viewed by participating students. It was understood that Lincoln Center wished to move away from class experience tied entirely to performances, but the basic principles on which performances and the art of performance are founded did not appear to be part of this program, either. The resultant audience behavior in both schools was often poor. Talking, laughing, and general bad response characterized many assemblies. Similarly, the artists were uninformed as to the nature of their audience or even the length of programs they were expected to present. A major instance of this occurred in one school at which the audience walked out while the performance was in progress. The bell had rung and they believed the period to be over. No one had told them that they had permission to remain a second period. This was unfortunate both from the point

of view of mood, instruction, and attitude and was equally devastating to audience and performers alike.

7. Scheduling. The evaluation team experienced several scheduling errors. At least twice in one school members of the team had appointments for observations which had been checked two weeks and then one week before the date. In both cases, classes were not in session when they arrived. "I forgot to tell you," was the excuse given by the resource professional.

The Instruments

A. Performing Artists

This inventory contained a disguised attitudinal set of questions whose purpose it was to elicit comments from students, both prior to and after participating in the Lincoln Center program, which could be identified as "positive" or "negative." It consisted of ten questions concerned with the appearance, speech, manner of movement, expressive abilities, background, work habits, and student reactions to performing artists including those involved with them in the classroom and those seen in performance.

The students were asked to list words which described each of these characteristics, with space provided for six words for each item. This was followed by space for short expressions of students' feelings about performing artists, thus giving some indication of their relationships with these artists. A total of sixty was the highest possible score.

Not only did the test identify positive and negative attitudes,

but it gave students an opportunity to respond with words from the performing arts vocabulary they had learned.

The response to this inventory produced the figures shown in Tables 1 and 2 (See Appendix F). Out of a possible high score of 60, the highest individual score was 43 and the lowest 0. The range of individual scores on the first administration was positive 2-36, negative 0-22, and total 2-43. On the second administration, it was positive 2-39, negative 0-14, and total 2-42.

The scores for 89 students in Table 2 were tabulated according to the five groups in which they were instructed. The average of all positive scores on the first administration was 12.98, on the second 10.65. The average of all negative scores on the first administration was 3.62 and on the second 2.16. The average of total scores, which served as an indication of verbal proficiency, was 16.58 on the first, and 13.08 on the second administration.

It should be noted that, while the range of individual scores revealed a few students who responded with a fairly large number of words or phrases, the average number of responses was low. For this reason, even though the average number of negative comments shows a reduction, it is not possible to measure any significant difference between the responses of "core" students who received two periods per week of instruction as opposed to those who were in "target" groups, receiving only one period per week of instruction.

The last two questions of this instrument solicited personal reactions to performing artists by asking directly for the answer to

"I like performing artists because..." and "I dislike performing artists because...". In the first administration, 75 students responded as follows:

30 students, or 40% gave positive statements
25 students, or 33% gave negative statements
20 students, or 27% left this question blank

On the second administration, 75 students were present and responded in the following manner:

26 students, or 35% were positive
21 students, or 28% were negative
28 students, or 37% failed to express an opinion.

The students who had positive reactions to performing artists on the first administration liked them because they were: "together, realistic, interesting, friendly, beautiful, entertaining." "They enjoy their work, can give happiness and joy in their performance, are doing something worthwhile, and you can learn from them." "They teach you to cope with problems you may face one day."

Students with negative reactions found performing artists "fake, pushy, snotty, conceited, ridiculous, weird, and silly." "They give us parts which are stupid and things are done which are not interesting." "They do sloppy jobs, they are a waste of time, and are very boring." The last complaint was voiced by nine students.

In the second administration, positive reactions were as follows: "I like performing artists because they are funny, exciting, entertaining, interesting, and talented." "They are nice, fun, enjoyable, friendly, natural, expressive, and sincere." "They are dedicated to their work."

"They want others to find out and see what this is all about." "They like to help you." "They can add new dimensions to songs, plays and your own feelings."

Negative reactions found performing artists "Mean, stupid, terrible, conceited, prejudiced." "They are too rational." "They give us some stupid plays and you get sick of working on them." "They are a waste of time." "They are boring and dull." Ten students concurred on this final statement.

The insignificant change in percentage of those who either liked or disliked performing artists, together with the repetition of comments on both pre and post-tests suggests that the program had little effect changing attitudes of students.

B. Perception and Understanding of the Performing Arts

This instrument was designed to give students an opportunity to list what some of the technical and other problems involved in presenting, producing, and performing each of the performing arts might be. The questionnaire was administered both pre and post. It asked students to list factors connected with their own experiences in participating in the performing arts. Geared to this active involvement phase of the Lincoln Center program, students were expected to be able to provide specific information on their own performing experiences. Space was provided for as many as fifteen phrases in answer to each question. This was also intended to provide some measure of students' understanding of performances in which they were not involved but which they had

seen performed by Lincoln Center groups. It also provided an opportunity, again, for students to utilize the performing arts vocabulary they had acquired in class sessions with Lincoln Center resource professionals and further, to demonstrate some primary understanding of the various media with which they had had experience.

A high score was thirty answers (ten for each of the three questions).

The response to the third question of this inventory was examined and tabulated. The results for the March administration and the May administration were coded and the results compared. (A number following an item indicates how many students mentioned the particular item.) The question and the responses most frequently given were as follows:

"What are some problems connected with your own experiences in participating in the special performing arts project in your school?"

March 1

Class cooperation and participation

Students don't participate (2)
I don't want to participate (9)
Some don't pay attention
Getting cooperation (6)
Getting everyone interested (9)
Getting to like it (3)
I don't like it. I went last term and it didn't turn out so good.
No administration cooperation

Direction

Having good instructors
Having well planned lessons

May 31

Class cooperation and participation

Students don't participate (2)
I don't want to participate (8)

Getting cooperation (6)
Getting involved
Getting to like it (2)
You must choose a play that will interest students. Then you will get cooperation (4)

Direction

Directors are inefficient (2)
Things are not well planned

March 1	May 31
Direction	**Direction**
I don't think the performers introduced the lesson interesting enough for us to comprehend	
Not arranged so good	
Not enough creativity. One teacher talks all the time.	
Same thing everytime	
It's boring (2)	Since they are boring, they don't get my attention
Performing Arts Vocabulary	**Performing Arts Vocabulary**
Casting (3)	Casting parts (6)
Props (2)	Scenery (2)
Scenery (2)	Stage designs and sets
Costumes (4)	Costumes, lighting
Script	Finding a good script (3)
Dialogue	Making dialogue
Learning to speak properly	Learning to project voices
Sounds	
Dances	Dance Steps
Doing Movements Well	
Songs (3)	
Music (2)	Music
Musicians	Musicians (4)
	Acoustics
General	**General**
Not enough time (2)	Not enough time
Lack of experience (2)	Lack of experience
Rehearsal time	Rehearsal time (3)
Student Feelings	**Student Feelings**
Stage fright (6)	Stage fright (7)
Butterflies in stomach	Getting nervous
Getting bold enough to get up	Performers getting sick
Having the right kind of mood	Getting ideas
Being good enough	
Lack of encouragement	

The open-ended quality of the questionnaire was responsible for producing data in several categories. Cognitive skills were

approached by means of responses under the heading of Performing Arts Vocabulary. These data were coded and analyzed. They are summarized in Table 4. Pre and post test statistics were compared by number and the results of this comparison were found not to be statistically significant.

Data gathered pertaining to the program participants' self-image in their experiences with the performing arts were obtained by the same means. Responses of students under Student Feelings were coded and analyzed. The results are summarized in Table 5. Pre and post test statistics were compared by number and the results of this comparison were found not to be statistically significant.

Finally, summaries of comparisons of the various groups of students involved in the study were statistically analyzed both pre and post (See tables 6,7,8, and 9).

Table 6 summarizes a comparison of the groups in relation to self attitude at the beginning of the program. At that point, there was no significant difference between groups.

Table 7 summarizes a comparison of the groups in relation to their conceptual knowledge at the beginning of the program. At that point there was no significant difference between the groups. The statistics demonstrate that all the groups began the program with an equivalent amount of knowledge about the arts, and an apparent similar feeling about themselves as evidenced in arts terminology.

Tabel 8 summarizes a comparison of the groups in relation to conceptual knowledge at the completion of the program. The difference

between the groups is significant at the .01 level. Further analysis, however, using a Schefé test, indicates that the overall difference in groups is due to the specific differences between groups 4 and 5 as opposed to the remaining groups.

Table 9 summarizes a comparison of the groups with regard to self attitude at the completion of the program. The F ratio is significant at the .05 level. This difference, however, is due to only one group, (group 4), and since all groups received the same treatment in terms of the Lincoln Center aspect of the program, this significance should be regarded as resulting from some other contingency.

C. The Performing Arts Program

This inventory consisted of two questions. The first was designed to discover how students felt about having the performing arts as part of their class curriculum, and whether the arts had contributed to the improvement of the classes. The second asked whether the performing arts had any effect on life outside the school or had contributed to its enjoyment. This questionnaire was given to the students and left with them so they might have longer to think about their responses. When completed it was to be returned to the classroom teachers. Seventy-three students filled out and returned their copies.

The test was distributed and completed by the middle of March. It was originally intended as a pre-test which would be repeated at the end of the program. After discussions with the director of the Lincoln Center Student Program, it was decided not to repeat this test but to create a new and broader questionnaire, entitled the Lincoln

Center Student Program, which was then used as a post-test.

The attitudes revealed by the responses to each question were first classified as "positive" or "negative." They were then analyzed as to the nature of their content. Those for Question 1 were grouped under sub-headings which indicated feelings, reason for positive feelings, and opinions concerning the improvement of the classes. Responses for Question 2 were grouped under sub-headings expressing opinions as to effects on life outside of school and on neighborhood and cultural programs. (A numeral following an item shows the number of students who indicated this item.) The results are listed as follows:

1. Please give your feeling about the inclusion of work with the performing arts in your classes this year. Please indicate if you think the arts can improve the classes.

Positive (38 students)

Feelings

Pretty good (3)
Very interesting (3)
It's all right (2)
I like it (2)
I enjoyed it
Amusing

Reasons for positive feelings

It taught me new things (4)

Very good for relaxing (2)

More ways of communicating
Lets students express themselves
Makes coming to school bearable
It's good to have something different (4)
Improved myself

Negative (35 students)

Feelings

It's so-so
It's a waste of time
It's rotten
I don't like it (6)
It's unnecessary

Reasons for negative feelings

I feel the performing arts classes are not that good
I don't think I should be taken out of an English major class to a performing arts class

Participating in the performing arts classes has proved to be embarrassing, depressing, and alienating

Improvement of classes	Improvement of classes
Can improve the English class	Not improving classes (11)
Improves my classes (6)	No effect on classes (4)
Makes classes more rewarding	Don't think so (5)
	Maybe they can but so far they haven't

2. Please give your feeling about whether or not your learning about the performing arts can have any effect on your life outside school. Can the arts contribute to your enjoyment of your out-of-school life in your own neighborhood; at cultural programs in other parts of the city?

Positive (35 students)	Negative (38 students)
Effect on life outside of school	Effect on life outside of school
Yes, some of the things might help (4)	No effect (16)
Yes, can affect outside life (6)	It does not (11)
Helps get rid of inhibitions (2)	It can't have any effect (2)
Gives me something to talk about (4)	I don't think so (2)
Adds to my knowledge of life (3)	No, it only made me aware a little
Helps me to understand better (2)	
Helps me in my singing (2)	
I think so (2)	
Neighborhood and cultural programs	Neighborhood and cultural programs
Yes, especially when I go to Lincoln Center (2)	It does not affect my home life (2)
Yes, it can contribute to cultural enjoyment in my neighborhood (3)	I don't think it will help around my neighborhood
Understand programs better and develop an appreciation (5)	

On the first question, 38 students, or 52% gave positive opinions while 35 students or 48% gave negative ones. For the second question, the percentages were reversed, as the negative responses increased from 48% to 52% and the positive responses dropped in similar fashion.

D. The Lincoln Center Student Program

A broad final questionnaire was created to solicit a direct evaluation from each student as to what he had learned in the program.

Questions were planned cooperatively by the evaluators and the project director of the Lincoln Center Student Program. The final instrument was the result of an agreement by all that it was comprehensive and definitive enough to accomplish its purpose.

Each student was asked whether he had learned new things working with artists in the classroom, and whether he now felt differently about the performing arts. He was asked whether he thought the program had had value for him and whether it had brought about any changes in his classmates. His opinion was requested as to whether there was any connection between the program and his other classes, what he thought was the purpose of the program, to what extent he thought the purpose had been achieved, and whether he would like to continue participation in the program.

All of the responses from sixty-five students were grouped and analyzed under "positive" or "negative" headings. Percentages of the group stating a particular attitude were computed. In addition, percentages for the considerable number of students who made no response to the questions were also computed. The results were as follows:

1. Please put some of your thoughts in the space provided below if you

a. Have learned new things working with artists in your classroom

Positive 17 students or 26%

How to put on a play (2)
How much work it is to put on a play (4)
Voice
Movement
Feeling
How the vocal system works

Positive

How to do exercises to relax
Some of the ways of performing
How to make a poem and set it to music (2)
How to express myself more freely through movement (2)
How to work with my classmates

Negative 23 students or 35%

It is no good to involve people who do not want it
No, did not learn new things (7)
Not much (6)
No artists in my classroom (4)
Nothing (2)
Good games for children
No, I knew it all before (2)

No response 25 students or 38%

b. Think and feel differently about the performing arts

Positive 14 students or 22%

I learned some people act differently
It is good for leisure time
Sometimes they are too much
I like them better (3)
Know what motivates the performers (2)
It is most interesting and fun to learn (2)
Everything is feel (2)
I still like them (2)

Negative 16 students or 25%

A waste of time
They are no good (12)
I dislike it
It's boring (2)

No response 35 students or 53%

2. Please put some of your thoughts in the space below if you did not become aware of new things, or learn very much.

I didn't become aware of new things because there wasn't that much taught
It's no good seeing people in something they don't want to be in
Don't think I learned much (3)
Please stop assuming Harlemites are stupid or ignorant
Learned nothing (8)

3. If you think the program has had value for you, please tell why.

Positive 25 students or 38%

Because I love to meet more people
Chance to work and learn about performing arts (10)
I like to learn new things (8)
Enjoyed the sessions (2)
It made good sense and had a lot of ideas
It helped me become less shy (2)
Became aware of a variety of ways of expressing myself

4. If you do not think the program has had value for you, please tell why.

Negative 25 students or 38%

Because we never did anything of value (3)
At first it was okay and then it got boring (3)
My class didn't want to participate
I don't want to be bothered with this junk
I don't understand it
I wasn't interested in what he was talking about
It wasn't interesting
It was a waste of time
The things we do are silly (3)
It was embarrassing doing all those little kid games (2)
I didn't like it
After this program, I was disappointed in the performing arts
I think this program is a waste of money. It is not based on us but on teachers' ideas.

5. What, if any, change of opinion about, or understanding of the performing arts have you observed in your classmates as a result of this program?

Positive 11 students or 17%

They have become more aware of things and they have learned how to act as a group (2)
They developed abilities to perform more
They have seen how varied the arts are
Many people openly expressed themselves (5)
They have learned how hard it is to achieve a production
We are cooperating more than we did last term

Negative 20 students or 31%

Not much of a change
They became negative to the whole thing after a while (3)
No change (16)

No response 34 students or 52%

6. Was there a connection between this program and your other classes at school? Please explain why you think this way.

Positive 8 students or 12%

Yes, with my English class (7) (These were students from Core Group 2)
It's a way of communicating with other people and finding out about their culture

Negative 39 students or 60%

No, it had nothing about what we learn in getting an education
No connection (36)
This is very different from our other classes
I don't think so

No response 18 students or 28%

7. What do you understand to be the purpose of the Lincoln Center Program in which you were involved?

26 students, or 40% had some idea

To introduce us to new ideas (3)
To get students involved in the performing arts (11)
To acquaint us with drama, dancing and music (6)
To make people act out their emotions and express their inner selves (3)
To bring out the talent in everyone and develop it (3)

14 students, or 22% did not know

25 students, or 38% made no response

8. To what extent do you feel the purpose was accomplished?

Positive 14 students, or 22%

A lot (7)
Fairly good extent (6)
About 50% (1)

Negative 20 students or 30%

Not very much (11)
No extent (9)

Made no response 31 students or 48%

9. I would like to continue participation in this program because

Positive 17 students or 26%

I liked the program and the people in it (11)
I like putting our ideas together
It shows you how to begin a future
It gives me a free period
I like a change of atmosphere

Negative 39 students or 60%

It was very boring (4)
It was too childish (2)
I felt weird jumping around (2)
I tried it twice and didn't like it
I didn't like it (3)
I got nothing out of it
Not teaching me how the performing artist really works
I think the performers could be better
No reason (31)

Made no response 9 students or 14%

To the two main questions posed in this inventory 60% of students responded that there was no connection between the arts experiences and their other classes. Twenty five students responded positively and twenty five negatively as to the value of the program for them.

Finally, 60% of the students indicated they did not wish to continue participation in this program.

Observations and Interviews

On a calendar which had to be adjusted frequently because of administrative and scheduling difficulties within the schools, the entire evaluation team (Professors Boardman, Ross, James) visited each of the two schools, periodically, to observe both teaching and performance aspects of the program (See Appendix E).

There were certain positive aspects to the classroom sessions. The evaluation team believes that the resource professionals from Lincoln Center were able to engender good rapport with students in the schools studied. In general, students were cooperative. Many entered into the activities with seeming interest. The results of the class sessions undoubtedly helped to reveal latent talents and abilities among a few potentially gifted young people. The sessions, at their best, did provide opportunities for students to ventilate their feelings in a positive and constructive manner.

The classroom aspects of the program in one school appeared to revolve around extemporized "experiences", with Lincoln Center resource professionals asking each other and the members of their classes, "What shall we do next?" In the other school, class sessions more frequently took the form of "improvisation" on a given idea, such as relating sounds to vocabulary. However, few lessons appeared to lead into subsequent class sessions and the absence of any kind of written plans and/or guides made it impossible to discover the scope and sequence of activities.

In the classroom sessions observed by the evaluation team members, a few references were made by resource professionals to performances by Lincoln Center touring groups which visited the schools and were seen by participating students. But this, too, was not developmentally planned or organized.

Evaluation of "Process"

In a meeting at the end of the study one of the evaluation team

directors heard from the Lincoln Center project director that she wished to have the "process" as well as the end results measured. The evaluation team agrees that this would have been highly desirable. However, as there was no apparent congruence between the classroom sessions developed in each school - indeed in many classes from day to day (some resource professionals had commented that they were in the school "to do my thing") - that evaluation of process was impossible.

Moreover, the confusion between developing student skills and their overall perception of the arts and artists in the instructional program was so marked that it became apparent neither the resource professionals, the school personnel, nor the administration of the Lincoln Center program had yet come to grips with the magnitude of the task inherent in creating a unique program for education in the arts.

The noted psychologist, Jean Piaget, after identifying certain "branches of learning" as being characterized "...by a mode of truth that does not depend upon more or less particular events resulting from many individual decisions, but upon a process of research and discovery..."[1] goes on the state:

> The problem then where truths of this type are concerned, is to decide whether they are better acquired by means of educational methods of transmission...or whether a truth is never truly assimilated as a truth except insofar as it has first been reconstructed or rediscovered by means of some activity adequate to that task."[2]

[1]Jean Piaget. Science of Education and the Psychology of the Child. (New York: A Viking Compass Book, 1972), p. 26.
[2]Ibid.

This is the key to the major difficulty of the Lincoln Center program. In attempting to develop means of activity adequate to the task of "discovering" the arts, the Lincoln Center instructional program was an admixture of sessions in which the resource professionals attempted to teach certain skills, and other sessions in which they were concerned with techniques ostensibly designed to "reconstruct" or "rediscover", through active participation, what the artistic process is all about. But the two parts did not blend into a viable whole.

In addition, the Lincoln Center instructional program was not really geared to take advantage of that period of adolescence "...characterized in general by the conquest of a new mode of reasoning, one that is no longer limited exclusively to dealing with objects or directly representable realities, but also employs 'hypotheses'..."[1] The ability of adolescents to grasp the meaning and purpose of creative instruction in the arts follows this cogent description of their stage of development. But students were not made aware of the reasons, purpose, or objectives of the program in which they were participants (it should not be forgotten that they were the most <u>important</u> participants). The results of the final questionnaire demonstrated that 60% had no idea why they were involved in such a program. Clearly, the teaching was inadequate to this task, as well.

[1] <u>Ibid</u>., p. 32.

Summary and Recommendations

The results of this year's study raise serious questions, most of which pertain to what was being taught and how it was being communicated, just as frequently as to why the end results were what they were.

1. Student Attitudes. The fact is simply that 60% of students responding to the test instruments (86% of the test population) did not wish to repeat their experiences in the arts program of Lincoln Center. An additional 14% did not respond at all, some of these may be assumed to be negative as well. The statistical analysis provides a striking comparison between groups involved in this study. There was no statistical significance between four of the five groups participating. An overall significance is reported at the .05 level (Table 9), but this must be attributed to only one of the groups which had the very active involvement of the classroom teacher in the school. It must be concluded, therefore, that this type of cooperation, commented upon further in the Recommendations of this evaluation, was vital to the one small success that did occur in the program, and would be necessary to future efforts in arts programs for the schools.

2. Student Achievement. Matched against the program objectives of Lincoln Center the responses of students revealed a minimal increase in the "store of information and facts about the performing arts," virtually no "performing arts vocabulary," little improved ability to "write critically about these arts." The evaluation team found no significant evidence that "productive communication between artists and young people"

had been enhanced. The statistical analysis revealed only the slightest difference between groups at the completion of this program at the .01 level (Table 8). This is attributed to the difference between two of the groups as compared to all the others. One of the groups is the same as that which achieved a rise in self-esteem as a result of the program having had heavy regular classroom teacher involvement. There is no way of accounting for the rise in conceptual knowledge of the second group (which had no parallel rise in self-esteem). It is felt by the evaluation team that the cause was probably also engendered by personal relationships with instructional personnel developed during the course of the study.

It has, however, recently come to the attention of the evaluation team that a visual arts program at one of the schools studied, taught by regular classroom teachers to non-English speaking students may have produced marked results in this area. A study of the contrast between these two programs would be of enormous interest.

3. Teacher Training. Observations by evaluation team members produced the information that there was no plan for, or implementation of, any program for "assisting teachers in classroom instruction through seminars, planning sessions, and workshops."

4. Perceptions of School Administrators. Lincoln Center has been kind enough to furnish the evaluation team with copies of letters of praise from various school administrators. It is remarkable that these are so far at variance with the comments of students in the two schools studied.

The entire problem that has followed evaluators of arts programs is profoundly illustrated by this dichotomy. Administrators in schools and at Lincoln Center continue to describe the involvement of students in arts activities in terms such as, "fabulous experience", "beautiful collaboration", "great impact". But the comments of students themselves reveal something vastly different. Not only the quantity of comments by students must be considered a great disappointment (they were distressingly short of knowledge of arts terminology and arts vocabulary), but the quality of feeling on the negative side of the column is much more penetrating than that given by students as reasons for their positive response. For example, just to say "I like a change of atmosphere", "It taught me new things", "to acquaint us with drama, dancing, and music", is much less provocative than "I think this program is a waste of money. It is not based on us but on teachers' ideas", "Please stop assuming that Harlemites are stupid or ignorant", "After this program, I was disappointed in the performing arts."

Where the program achieved its most positive results, however, was in awakening a feeling among students for the potential of their peers and for a beginning understanding that the arts have some value in the realm of "self expression." But comments of this order were relatively few and the evaluation team feels that these could just as likely have been made by students who already had this attitude at the beginning of the program.

Certainly a major rethinking of the Lincoln Center program and its

content needs to be effected. Unfortunately, the evaluation team was informed by the project director that as of June 15, 1972, no proposal had yet been developed for the 1972-73 school year. The evaluation team deplores this type of "brinksmanship" which seems to characterize the origins of Lincoln Center staff proposals each year. It was certainly far too late, then, to develop a proposal adequate to the task of surmounting the difficulties encountered by the Lincoln Center program over the past two years.

The Public Investment in Lincoln Center

Nevertheless, it must be recognized that, at present, there is no substitute for the structure, organization, and experience of the Lincoln Center operation. In addition, according to Lincoln Center, public funding of the program evaluated by this study amounted to 56%. The remaining 44% should also be considered publicly aided, as contributions to Lincoln Center are tax deductible.

The aims of the recommendation contained in this evaluation, therefore, are not to "throw the baby out with the bath water." Rather, they are, in the opinion of the evaluation team, for the improvement of education in the arts that can in fact have national implications and can immeasurably enhance such education for the children of this State.

Recommendations

The evaluation team recommends that:

1. Serious consideration should be given to not funding the Lincoln Center program in the New York City schools until a full and realistic appraisal has been undertaken of those factors that have contributed to

both the successes and failures of the program.

2. The appraisal should be undertaken by the State with representatives of various educational forces (i.e. public schools, Lincoln Center) taking active part.

3. The study should involve, additionally, representatives of the education profession at all levels, including some of the most prominent authorities in the field of child and adolescent development.

4. The study group should be joined by successful teachers of general music and other arts in the public schools, by the Directors of the various arts in the public schools, by students.

It is recommended that:

5. The study should occupy itself, in the main, not with philosophic content, but with a clear and coherent approach to the presentation of both skill learning and the development of perceptual insights. The study should yield a curriculum with measurable objectives, the objectives and form of measurement being developed at one and the same time. This is the real material of which "process" is made. There is nothing wrong in having a format with which teachers and professionals may work. Indeed, there is everything to commend this "process."

6. No program should be initiated in any school without the fullest possible cooperation of the school administration, and, even more significantly, the availability of a core group of teachers who have both the willingness to participate and the training to carry it out. It is the conclusion of the evaluation team, derived from evidence of years of experience in the field, and supported by the statistical evidence of this study, that an

arts program which exists apart from the fabric of the regular school curriculum cannot work. Devoting 2/5 of a weekly schedule of an English class to such a program does not produce a relevant arts experience. Providing even 4/5 of such a time schedule will not do the job, either. Herein lies the crux of the entire problem: that is no arts program can succeed it if is an adjunct contrived to fit an existing curriculum. An arts experience, tied to the purposes and directions of the school, should exist as central to the study of many of the "academic" disciplines to which it is related.

7. No program should be initiated in any school in which students are not aware of its implications. Students should be given a clear and forthright statement about the aims and objectives of experimental learning situations. They should not be expected to guess at what is being presented to them. They should be partners in the overall design. It is discouraging that only six students began to realize some of the more basic objectives of the program (self-expression, development of individual abilities). It is further distressing evidence that 47% either said they did not know what the purpose of the Lincoln Center program was or did not respond at all to this question.

8. When the plan for a program is strong, a system of seminars, institutes and/or workshops should be established for those teachers whose classes will be involved in any future arts program. Without the wholehearted cooperation of the teaching staff in a school, no arts experience can succeed, either. Many questions remain open regarding

this final recommendation: how shall the teachers be selected; how shall they participate; how shall they be rewarded (academic credit?); who shall teach them; how shall the teaching take shape? But these are questions for a later date. It is far too early to announce such a phase of the program and it would be better to wait until a real program emerges from a new structure.

Name _____ Date _____ Group _____

PERFORMING ARTISTS

This year we are seeing and learning about the performing arts. On these pages, you will find some items or questions about performing artists. Please answer with words that will tell some of the things you know and what you think about performing artists. Please do your best to think of as many words as possible. If you want to use a word but are not sure of the spelling, just write it the way it sounds to you.

Have you already seen a performing artist? Yes _____ No _____

If yes, what kind (s)? _____ _____ _____ _____

1. What words do you know that describe the way performing artists dress off-stage

   _____ _____ _____

   _____ _____ _____

2. What words do you think describe the appearance of a performing artist on stage?

   _____ _____ _____

   _____ _____ _____

3. What words describe the speech of performing artists?

   _____ _____ _____

   _____ _____ _____

4. What words can you give to describe the manner in which performing artists move?

   _____ _____ _____

   _____ _____ _____

5. What words would describe their background and training in their chosen profession?

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

6. What words would you use to tell about their work habits?

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

7. What are some traits of performing artists?

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

8. What are some of the feelings that performing artists can express?

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

9. I like performing artists because they are: _____

_____

_____

_____

10. I dislike performing artists because they are: _____

_____

_____

Name _____ Date _____ Group _____

PERCEPTION AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE PERFORMING ARTS

There are always problems concerned with creation, production and performance in each of the performing arts. Many times we can see the problems without really seeing how to solve them. Tell what you think some of the problems are; you don't have to give any solutions.

What are some of the problems with a piano recital?

!!! getting a piano

choosing the music to play

giving a good performance

You can probably think of other problems. For example: "having a good bench for the pianist to sit on." Write that problem on the blank line above.

On each of the following pages, read the name of one of the performing arts media, and then write problems connected with its creation, production and performance. Work fast, but only on the page you are told to work on.

When you are told, turn the page, read the name of the media, and begin to work on that page.

What are some problems connected with the creation, production and performance of a play?

What are some problems connected with the creation, production and performance of a dance recital?

What are some problems connected with your own experiences in participating in the special performing arts project in your school?

Name_____Date_____Group_____

THE PERFORMING ARTS PROGRAM

In trying to discover ways through which the performing arts might contribute to a better school program and to your interests and activities outside of school, we are asking that you consider the following questions and write brief answers, according to your honest opinions.

Please understand that there are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Whatever you think about the items below, providing you feel deeply about them, is just what we are looking for. We are interested in your real reactions to the performing arts, their place in your school, and their place in your life.

1. Please give your feeling about the inclusion of work with the performing arts in your classes this year. Please indicate if you think the arts can improve the classes.

2. Please give your feeling about whether or not your learning about the performing arts can have any effect on your life outside of school. Can the arts contribute to your enjoyment of your out-of-school life in your own neighborhood; at cultural programs in other parts of the city?

Name_____ Date_____ Group_____

THE LINCOLN CENTER STUDENT PROGRAM

We would appreciate your sharing with us some of your thoughts about seeing, hearing, or reacting to things around you, either at school or outside school as a result of working with artists or attending performances from Lincoln Center.

1. Please put some of your thoughts in the space provided below if you

   a. have learned new things working with artists in your classroom

   b. think and feel differently about the performing arts

2. Please put some of your thoughts in the space provided below if you did not become aware of new things, or learn very much.

3. If you think the program has had value for you, please tell why

4. If you do not think the program has had value for you, please tell why

5. What, if any, change of opinion about, or understanding of, the performing arts have you observed in your classmates as a result of this program? (If you have not observed a change please indicate this, too)

_____

_____

_____

6. Was there a connection between this program and your other classes at school? ( )Yes ( ) No. Please explain why you think this way.

_____

_____

_____

7. What do you understand to be the purpose of the Lincoln Center program in which you were involved?

_____

_____

_____

8. To what extent do you feel the purpose was accomplished?

_____

_____

_____

9. I would ( ) would not ( ) like to continue participation in this program because

_____

_____

CALENDAR

February 16	James visited R.P. sessions in both schools
February 23	James visited performance madrigal group in School B James visited R.P. session at School A
March 1	Boardman, Ross, and James visited R.P. session in School B James administered first testing session at School A
March 17	James administered first testing session at School B
March 22	Boardman visited R.P. sessions at School B (cancelled)
April 12	Boardman visited R.P. sessions at School B
April 19	Boardman, Ross, and James visited R.P. sessions at School A
May 3	James visited performance of dance group at School B
May 10	James visited performance of opera at School A
May 19	James administered second testing session at School B
May 23	James completed second testing session at School B
May 31	James administered second testing session at School A

APPENDIX E

TABLE 1

PERFORMING ARTISTS

RANGE OF INDIVIDUAL SCORES

	Positive		Negative		Total	
	Mar 1	May 31	Mar 1	May 31	Mar 1	May 31
Core Group I (16) (October - May, 2 sessions per week)	0-20	2-39	0-8	0-10	0-20	2-49
Core Group 2 (18) (February - May, 2 sessions per week)	3-26	0-25	1-8	0-14	7-38	6-27
Group 3 (17) (October - May, 1 session per week)	3-22	0-23	0-13	0-4	7-26	5-24
Group 4 (20) (October - May, 1 session per week)	0-29	0-15	0-22	0-10	8-34	0-17
Group 5 (18) (October - May, 1 session per week)	8-36	7-38	0-8	0-4	10-43	10-42
ALL GROUPS (89)	0-36	0-39	0-22	0-14	0-43	0-42

TABLE 2

AVERAGES OF 89 STUDENTS

	Positive		Negative		Total	
	Mar 1	May 31	Mar 1	May 31	Mar 1	May 31
Core Group 1 (16)	[illegible]0	12.0	2.0	3.0	11.0	15.0
Core Group 2 (18)	14.2	11.5	3.4	2.3	17.6	14.0
Group 3 (17)	12.5	12.2	5.2	.7	17.6	13.0
Group 4 (20)	12.2	6.0	4.8	3.2	17.0	9.2
Group 5 (18)	17.0	12.6	2.7	1.6	19.7	14.2
ALL GROUPS (89)	12.98	10.86	3.62	2.16	16.58	13.08

APPENDIX F

TABLE 3

PERCEPTION AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE PERFORMING ARTS

AVERAGES OF 89 STUDENTS

	Mar 1	May 31
Core Group 1 (16)	10.0	15.0
Core Group 2 (18)	10.8	12.8
Group 3 (17)	13.4	11.0
Group 4 (20)	9.4	7.7
Group 5 (18)	6.6	7.0
GROUP AVERAGE (89)	10.0	10.7

APPENDIX G

TABLE 4

SUMMARY: ANALYSIS OF PERCEPTION AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE PERFORMING ARTS (COGNITIVE)

Pre		Post	
Mean	10.16	Mean	9.09
Standard Deviation	5.04	Standard Deviation	6.19
N=80		N=53	

t=1.038

(t not significant at .01 or .05 level)

TABLE 5

SUMMARY: ANALYSIS OF ASSESSMENT OF SELF-ESTEEM

Pre		Post	
Mean	1.56	Mean	2.48
Standard Deviation	2.25	Standard Deviation	2.81
N=73		N=62	

t=2.06

(t not significant at .01 or .05 level)

APPENDIX H

TABLE 6

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELF ATTITUDE
AT PROGRAM INCEPTION

	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F Ratio
Between Groups	43.9456	4	10.9864	2.4987
Within Groups	316.5732	72	4.3969	
TOTAL	360.5188	76		

TABLE 7

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF CONCEPTUAL KNOWLEDGE
OF ARTS AT PROGRAM INCEPTION

	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F Ratio
Between Groups	268.1733	4	67.0433	2.7561
Within Groups	1848.7363	76	24.3255	
TOTAL	2116.9097	80		

(F not significant)

TABLE 8

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF CONCEPTUAL KNOWLEDGE OF ARTS
AT PROGRAM COMPLETION

	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F Ratio
Between Groups	1652.2974	4	413.0742	10.0472**
Within Groups	2425.6826	59	41.1133	
TOTAL	4077.9800	63		

**.01

TABLE 9

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELF ATTITUDE
AT PROGRAM COMPLETION

	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F Ratio
Between Groups	363.5269	4	90.8817	7.7732*
Within Groups	654.7344	56	11.6917	
TOTAL	1018.2612	60		

* greater than .05

APPENDIX J